



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Considerations of this kind show that the dependence of labor on a local market is a necessity of its nature, and that a world market cannot be created for it by the extension of any system of exchange.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE.

H. C. EMERY.

Women Wage-Earners: their Past, their Present and their Future. By HELEN CAMPBELL. Boston, Roberts Brothers, 1893. — viii, 313 pp.

This book is an attempt to collect all the facts concerning working-women in a convenient and readable form. The author's purpose, as stated in the introduction, is to "aid all other women in their struggle, . . . to define the nature, the necessities and the limits of such struggle," and "to discover, through such light as past and present may cast, the future for women workers the world over."

Mrs. Campbell's opening chapter, on the condition of women from primitive times to the latter part of the eighteenth century, is quite unsatisfactory, and has little relation to the rest of the book. The following chapters, which show the employments for women during colonial times and during the early period of the factory system, the rise and growth of trades, the relation of labor bureaus to women, the present rates of wages in the United States, the general conditions for English, continental and American workers, and the evils and abuses attendant thereon, contain much information in an available form for the popular reader.

It is unfortunate, however, that the statistics are frequently so inaccurate as to render the book untrustworthy. For example, the table on page 108 is said to have been "copied with minute care from that given in the last census; and while it shows one or two deficiencies, the writer is in no sense responsible for them, its accuracy, as a whole, not being affected by the slight discrepancy referred to." It is perplexing to find, after this, that the percentage of males employed in book-binding is given as 4.831; of females, 4.553; of children, 6.16. In the table of the census report from which these figures are copied, the corresponding percentages are 48.31, 45.53 and 6.16. "Minute care," in statistics, involves attention even to decimal points. Neglect of this fact has rendered the author's table worthless.

Again, let us test the accuracy of the following paragraph:

In 1865 women operatives in the factories of Massachusetts were 32,239, or nineteen per cent of men operatives. In 1875 they were 83,207, or

twenty-six per cent; and the increase since that date has been in like proportion. . . . In Massachusetts mills women and children are from two-thirds to five-sixths of all employed, and the proportion in all the manufacturing portions of New England is nearly the same. [Page 89.]

The Massachusetts census report for 1885 states that there were 83,207 women employed in factories in 1875. This is twenty-six per cent of the total number of persons so employed, and not twenty-six per cent "of men operatives." (The relative proportion of men and women was 35.67 women to one hundred men.) Taking the author's "nineteen per cent" in the same sense, as based on the total number employed, the increase from 1865 to 1875 was about seven per cent. In 1885 the number of women in factories was 112,762, or 28.58 per cent of the total number of persons employed in manufactures. The increase from 1875 to 1885 was therefore about *two* per cent,—by no means an increase "in like proportion" to that of the preceding decade. Furthermore, a comparison of similar statistics in the Massachusetts annual report on the statistics of manufactures for 1892, shows a decrease in the proportion of women employed in the 4473 factories from which these statistics are mainly collected. These establishments are engaged in seventy-five classified industries, and each year statistics are gathered from these establishments only; they therefore show the general tendency of industrial conditions. In 1885 women were 33 per cent of all persons employed in these factories; in 1891 they were 33.76 per cent,—a very slight relative increase; and in 1892 they were 33.45 per cent—a relative decrease as compared with the proportion of men. Mrs. Campbell's sweeping assertion that the increase since 1875 "has been in like proportion" to that from 1865 to 1875 evidently is not confirmed by statistics.

The statement that "in Massachusetts mills women and children are from two-thirds to five-sixths of all employed," is also open to criticism. The sentence is far from clear. It may mean that women and children are from two-thirds to five-sixths of all persons employed in factories, or of all women and children employed in any remunerative occupation. The figures presumably are based upon the census report of 1885. They cannot be correct with either interpretation. The number of females engaged in remunerative occupations in 1885 was 213,147; this number probably includes female children at work. If the 1907 male children be added, the total number of women and children engaged in remunerative occupations is found to be 215,054. In the same way, by adding the

1081 male children employed in factories to the 112,762 females, the total number of women and children is estimated to be 113,843, — 52.93 per cent of all women and children in remunerative occupations, and 28.85 per cent of all persons employed in factories. In neither case are they “from two-thirds to five-sixths of all employed.” The statement that “the proportion in all the manufacturing portions of New England is nearly the same,” partakes of the same error. It is surprising that it could have been made by a writer who, on another page, says that women in Connecticut form “twenty-five per cent of all employed in factories” (page 192). It seems strange, also, that the relative proportions of women and children employed in factories are so different in Massachusetts and Connecticut. In Massachusetts, 112,762 females and 1838 children were in factories in 1885; in Connecticut (page 192), “over thirty thousand women and girls are engaged in factory work, and *ten thousand* children.” So remarkable a statement should have been accompanied by the citation of statistical authorities.

Mrs. Campbell is at times as unsound in theory as she is inaccurate in statistics. She attaches importance to the so-called “just wage.” “Just pay,” she says, “heads the list of remedies” (page 251). But she must admit that there can be no other “just pay” than that which equals the value of the work performed; and that this value must be determined wholly by market conditions. Often the product practically adds nothing to the wealth of the world. “Just pay” would, in this case, be no pay. It certainly would not approximate the “minimal rate which will enable the least paid to live upon her earnings” (page 264). Would Mrs. Campbell be satisfied with such “just pay”? It is strange that she can employ this misleading term, since she very plainly sees the matter in its true light.

The lowering of wage may be considered, then, as in one sense remedial, and the present state of things as in part the mere action of inevitable and inescapable law. . . . I have come at last to regard all as our education in justice and a demand for training in such wise as shall render unskilled labor more and more impossible. So long as it exists, however, I see no outlook but the fluctuating and uncertain wage, the natural result of the existence of the lowest order of workers. [Page 271.]

In considering the efficiency of women’s work as compared with that of men, Mrs. Campbell on page 269 claims that, “given the same grade of intelligence, the work of women is fully equal to that of men.” But on the next page she admits that women are especially

deficient in the smaller virtues of "punctuality, unvarying quality of work, a sense of business honor and of personal fidelity, each to all and all to each," and that various physiological and social reasons make her "often a less dependable worker than man." These conditions may and often do accompany a high degree of intelligence, and, until they are changed, women's work cannot be fully equal to that of men.

The style of the book is often incorrect, awkward and ambiguous. The bibliography is defective, both in the French and the English authorities.

J. L. BROWNELL.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

Outlines of Economics. By RICHARD T. ELY, LL.D. New York, Hunt & Eaton, 1893. — xii, 432 pp.

The most noticeable feature of Professor Ely's new work is his division of economics into two branches, private and public. To be sure, this classification is not altogether new. The Germans have their *Staatswirthschaft*, and the Italians also speak of the economy of the state. In America, the classification now adopted by Dr. Ely has long been used in the class-room by Professor Folwell, who has twice urged its general adoption before the American Economic Association. In the annual address before that body at Chautauqua he attributed the popular distrust of economics to the long neglect of public economy by the devotees of the science. But as he pointed out, the existence of a science of public economy has been tacitly admitted by American economists; and Professor James has recognized it in express terms by publishing a monograph on *The Public Economy of Pennsylvania*. Indeed, we may go back to the middle of the century, and find that Theodore Sedgwick had written on *Public and Private Economy*, and that Calvin Cotton was professor of "public economy" in Trinity College and the author of a book entitled *Public Economy for the United States*. Said Dr. Cotton in this work:

We have not rejected the usual title of "*political* economy" because we proposed to enter a new field; but, chiefly, because the term "political" has been so much lowered in this country by the rude agitations of what are commonly called "politics," that we do not think the term now so well comports, among us, with the dignity of our theme.

But there are weightier reasons for rejecting the old name political economy than that given by Dr. Cotton. As used by the Greeks,